

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-47 are pending, of which claims 1, 15, 25, and 36 have been amended.

5

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6, 15-17, 25-27 and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,740,336 to Wakisaka et al. (hereinafter, "*Wakisaka*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10

Claim 1 recites a system of control panels for multifunction print devices, the system of control panels comprising multiple control panels each of which include:

15

multiple regions each of which are associated with a different function of the multifunction print devices;

20

selectable controls grouped by functional relation into one or more control groups, the selectable controls of an individual control group arranged within a region associated with a function of the individual control group; and

25

wherein at least one control panel does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel.

30

Wakisaka does not show or disclose the system of control panels for multifunction print devices recited in claim 1. For example, Wakisaka does not show or disclose that at least one of the control panels does not include the

selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel, as recited in claim 1.

Referring to Figs. 2-4 of the pending Application, examples of three separate control panels (*i.e.*, control panels 200, 300, and 400) are illustrated.

5 Each of these exemplary control panels are divided into four functional regions as shown (*i.e.*, a fax region 202, a print region 204, a copy region 206, and a scan region 208). Control panel 200 in Fig. 2 includes selectable controls in each of the multiple regions of the control panel such that there are selectable controls present in the fax region 202, in the print region 204, in the copy
10 region 206, and in the scan region 208 of the control panel. In contrast, control panel 400 in Fig. 4 does not include selectable controls in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel – as is recited in claim 1. For example, control panel 400 does not include any selectable controls in the scan region 404.

15 The Office cites Fig. 4 of *Wakisaka* as disclosing the features of claim 1 (*Office Action* p. 3; *Wakisaka* Fig. 4). However, *Wakisaka* says nothing about a system comprising multiple control panels for multifunctional printing devices, or that at least one of the control panels does not include the selectable controls in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel, as recited in
20 claim 1. The Office refers to a “facsimile portion” which is shown to include buttons, and the Office has acknowledged that the number buttons for the “facsimile portion” of the device are arranged within the “facsimile portion” (*Office Action* p. 3; *Wakisaka* Fig. 4). Therefore, the “facsimile portion” in Fig. 4 of *Wakisaka* referenced by the Office is clearly not a region of at least
25 one control panel that does not include the selectable controls, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Wakisaka for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that §102 rejection be withdrawn.

5 Claims 2-4 and 6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-4 and 6 may be allowable over Wakisaka for independent reasons.

10 Claim 15 recites a control panel for multifunction print devices that “does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel.” As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Wakisaka does not show or disclose a control panel that does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel, as
15 recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over Wakisaka for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that §102 rejection be withdrawn.

20 Claims 16-17 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 15. Additionally, some or both of claims 16-17 may be allowable over Wakisaka for independent reasons.

25 Claim 25 recites a system of control panels for multifunction devices, ... where “at least one control panel does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control

panel.” As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Wakisaka does not show or disclose a system of control panels, as recited in claim 25.

Further, Wakisaka does not show or disclose a control panel that does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one
5 of the multiple regions of the control panel, as recited in claim 25. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over Wakisaka for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that §102 rejection be withdrawn.

10 Claims 26-27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 25. Additionally, some or both of claims 26-27 may be allowable over Wakisaka for independent reasons.

Claim 36 recites a method in which multiple control panels include “at
15 least one control panel that does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel.” As described above in response to the rejection of claims 1 and 25, Wakisaka does not show or disclose multiple control panels, as recited in claim 36.

20 Further, Wakisaka does not show or disclose multiple control panels including at least one control panel that does not include the selectable controls of an individual control group in at least one of the multiple regions of the control panel.” Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable over Wakisaka for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that §102
25 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 37-40 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 36. Additionally, some or all of claims 37-40 may be allowable over Wakisaka for independent reasons.

5 **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

Claims 8, 10, 12-14, 22-24, 30-31, 33-34, 42-43, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Wakisaka (*Office Action* p.7). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10 Claims 5, 9, 18, 20, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Wakisaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,765 to Tomita (hereinafter, "*Tomita*") (*Office Action* p.11). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

15 Claims 7, 19, 29, 35, 41, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Wakisaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,836 to Altrieth, III et al. (hereinafter, "*Altrieth*") (*Office Action* p.13). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

20 Claims 11, 21, 32, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Wakisaka in view Altrieth, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,107 to Morisaki (hereinafter, "*Morisaki*") (*Office Action* p.16). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

25 Applicant notes that the claims rejected under §103 are all dependent claims which ultimately depend from one of the allowable independent claims 1, 15, 25, or 36 as described above in response to the §102 rejections. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Accordingly, each and every claim depending from an independent claim 1, 15, 25, or 36 is allowable for at least the reasons

discussed above in response to the rejection of the independent claims, and may be allowable over the cited references for independent reasons.

Further, Applicant notes that Tomita, Morisaki, and/or Altrieth do not cure the deficiencies of Wakisaka as described above in response to the §102 rejections of independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 36. Additionally, none of the independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness, and are therefore nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103. As stated in the MPEP §2143.03, "[i]f an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious."

In accordance with the above referenced tenet and preceding discussion, all of the claims that depend ultimately from an independent claim 1, 15, 25, or 36 are also nonobvious. Specifically, claims 2-14 which depend from allowable claim 1, claims 16-24 which depend from allowable claim 15, claims 26-35 which depend from allowable claim 25, and claims 37-47 which depend from allowable claim 36 are nonobvious for the reasons stated above.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn, and that each of the dependent claims be allowed.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-47 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is
5 urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 22, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

10